

1 SO. CAL. EQUAL ACCESS GROUP
2 Jason J. Kim (SBN 190246)
3 Jason Yoon (SBN 306137)
4 Kevin Hong (SBN 299040)
5 101 S. Western Ave., Second Floor
6 Los Angeles, CA 90004
7 Telephone: (213) 252-8008
8 Facsimile: (213) 252-8009
9 cm@SoCalEAG.com

10 Attorneys for Plaintiff
11 KENNETH DAVIDSON

12
13
14 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
15 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

16 KENNETH DAVIDSON,

17 Plaintiff,

18 vs.

19 KING FISH, INC.; BORIS B. LEVIN; and
20 DOES 1 to 10,

21 Defendants.

22
23 **Case No.:**

24 COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE
25 RELIEF AND DAMAGES FOR DENIAL
OF CIVIL RIGHTS OF A DISABLED
PERSON IN VIOLATIONS OF

1. AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES
ACT, 42 U.S.C. §12131 et seq.;
2. CALIFORNIA'S UNRUH CIVIL
RIGHTS ACT;
3. CALIFORNIA'S DISABLED
PERSONS ACT;
4. CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY
CODE;
5. NEGLIGENCE

26 Plaintiff KENNETH DAVIDSON ("Plaintiff") complains of Defendants KING
27 FISH, INC.; BORIS B. LEVIN; and DOES 1 to 10 ("Defendants") and alleges as
28 follows:

PARTIES

29 1. Plaintiff is a California resident with a physical disability. Plaintiff is
30 diagnosed with paraplegia secondary to MVA damaging T7 and is substantially limited in

1 his ability to walk. Plaintiff requires the use of a wheelchair at all times when traveling in
2 public.

3 2. Defendants are, or were at the time of the incident, the real property owners,
4 business operators, lessors and/or lessees of the real property for a seafood market
5 ("Business") located at or about 722 N. Glendale Ave., Glendale, California.

6 3. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate or
7 otherwise of Defendant DOES 1 through 10, and each of them, are unknown to Plaintiff,
8 who therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will ask leave of
9 Court to amend this Complaint when the true names and capacities have been
10 ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and, based thereon, alleges that each such
11 fictitiously named Defendants are responsible in some manner, and therefore, liable to
12 Plaintiff for the acts herein alleged.

13 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that, at all relevant
14 times, each of the Defendants was the agent, employee, or alter-ego of each of the other
15 Defendants, and/or was acting in concert with each of the other Defendants, and in doing
16 the things alleged herein was acting with the knowledge and consent of the other
17 Defendants and within the course and scope of such agency or employment relationship.

18 5. Whenever and wherever reference is made in this Complaint to any act or
19 failure to act by a defendant or Defendants, such allegations and references shall also be
20 deemed to mean the acts and failures to act of each Defendant acting individually, jointly
21 and severally.

22 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

23 6. The Court has jurisdiction of this action pursuant to 28 USC §§ 1331 and
24 1343 for violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, (42 USC §12101, *et*
25 *seq.*).

26 7. Pursuant to pendant jurisdiction, attendant and related causes of action,
27 arising from the same nucleus of operating facts, are also brought under California law,
28

1 including, but not limited to, violations of California Civil Code §§51, 51.5, 52(a), 52.1,
2 54, 54., 54.3 and 55.

3 8. Plaintiff's claims are authorized by 28 USC §§ 2201 and 2202.

4 9. Venue is proper in this court pursuant to 28 USC §1391(b). The real
5 property which is the subject of this action is located in this district, Los Angeles County,
6 California, and that all actions complained of herein take place in this district.

7 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

8 10. In or about December of 2023, Plaintiff went to the Business.

9 11. The Business is a seafood market business establishment, open to the public,
10 and is a place of public accommodation that affects commerce through its operation.
11 Defendants provide parking spaces for customers.

12 12. While attempting to enter the Business during each visit, Plaintiff personally
13 encountered a number of barriers that interfered with his ability to use and enjoy the
14 goods, services, privileges, and accommodations offered at the Business.

15 13. To the extent of Plaintiff's personal knowledge, the barriers at the Business
16 included, but were not limited to, the following:

17 a. Defendants failed to comply with the federal and state standards for
18 the parking space designated for persons with disabilities. Defendants
19 failed to provide proper van accessible space designated for the
20 persons with disabilities as there were no "NO PARKING" markings,
21 blue borderlines, or blue hatched lines painted on the surface of the
22 pavement to indicate the presence of an access aisle.

23 b. Defendants failed to comply with the federal and state standards for
24 the parking space designated for persons with disabilities. Defendants
25 failed to mark the space with the International Symbol of
26 Accessibility. Additionally, the Defendants failed to paint the
27 identifying blue perimeter line around the accessible parking space.

14. These barriers and conditions denied Plaintiff full and equal access to the Business and caused Plaintiff difficulty and frustration. Plaintiff wishes to return and patronize the Business; however, Plaintiff is deterred from visiting the Business because his knowledge of these violations prevents him from returning until the barriers are removed.

15. Based on the violations, Plaintiff alleges, on information and belief, that there are additional barriers to accessibility at the Business after further site inspection. Plaintiff seeks to have all barriers related to his disability remedied. *See Doran v. 7-Eleven, Inc.* 524 F.3d 1034 (9th Cir. 2008).

16. In addition, Plaintiff alleges, on information and belief, that Defendants knew that particular barriers render the Business inaccessible, violate state and federal law, and interfere with access for the physically disabled.

17. At all relevant times, Defendants had and still have control and dominion over the conditions at this location and had and still have the financial resources to remove these barriers without much difficulty or expenses to make the Business accessible to the physically disabled in compliance with ADDAG and Title 24 regulations. Defendants have not removed such barriers and have not modified the Business to conform to accessibility regulations.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLETATION OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990

18. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each of the allegations in all prior paragraphs in this complaint.

19. Under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (“ADA”), no individual shall be discriminated against on the basis of disability in the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations of any place of public accommodation by any person who owns, leases, or leases to, or operates a place of public accommodation. *See 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a).*

20. Discrimination, *inter alia*, includes:

- 1 a. A failure to make reasonable modification in policies, practices, or
2 procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford such
3 goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations
4 to individuals with disabilities, unless the entity can demonstrate that
5 making such modifications would fundamentally alter the nature of
6 such goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or
7 accommodations. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii).
- 8 b. A failure to take such steps as may be necessary to ensure that no
9 individual with a disability is excluded, denied services, segregated or
10 otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of the
11 absence of auxiliary aids and services, unless the entity can
12 demonstrate that taking such steps would fundamentally alter the
13 nature of the good, service, facility, privilege, advantage, or
14 accommodation being offered or would result in an undue burden. 42
15 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iii).
- 16 c. A failure to remove architectural barriers, and communication barriers
17 that are structural in nature, in existing facilities, and transportation
18 barriers in existing vehicles and rail passenger cars used by an
19 establishment for transporting individuals (not including barriers that
20 can only be removed through the retrofitting of vehicles or rail
21 passenger cars by the installation of a hydraulic or other lift), where
22 such removal is readily achievable. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv).
- 23 d. A failure to make alterations in such a manner that, to the maximum
24 extent feasible, the altered portions of the facility are readily
25 accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities, including
26 individuals who use wheelchairs or to ensure that, to the maximum
27 extent feasible, the path of travel to the altered area and the
28 bathrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains serving the altered

1 area, are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with
2 disabilities where such alterations to the path or travel or the
3 bathrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains serving the altered area
4 are not disproportionate to the overall alterations in terms of cost and
5 scope. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2).

6 21. Where parking spaces are provided, accessible parking spaces shall be
7 provided. 1991 ADA Standards § 4.1.2(5); 2010 ADA Standards § 208. One in every
8 eight accessible spaces, but not less than one, shall be served by an access aisle 96 in
9 (2440 mm) wide minimum and shall be designated "van accessible." 1991 ADA
10 Standards § 4.1.2(5)(b). For every six or fraction of six parking spaces, at least one shall
11 be a van accessible parking space. 2010 ADA Standards § 208.2.4.

12 22. For the parking spaces, access aisles shall be marked with a blue painted
13 borderline around their perimeter. The area within the blue borderlines shall be marked
14 with hatched lines a maximum of 36 inches (914 mm) on center in a color contrasting
15 with that of the aisle surface, preferably blue or white. The words "NO PARKING" shall
16 be painted on the surface within each access aisle in white letters a minimum of 12 inches
17 (305 mm) in height and located to be visible from the adjacent vehicular way. CBC §
18 11B-502.3.3.

19 23. Here, Defendants failed to provide a proper access aisle as there were no
20 "NO PARKING" markings, blue borderlines, or blue hatched lines painted on the parking
21 surface to indicate the presence of an access aisle.

22 24. The surface of each accessible car and van space shall have surface
23 identification complying with either of the following options: The outline of a profile
24 view of a wheelchair with occupant in white on a blue background a minimum 36" wide
25 by 36" high (914 mm x 914 mm). The centerline of the profile view shall be a maximum
26 of 6 inches (152 mm) from the centerline of the parking space, its sides parallel to the
27 length of the parking space and its lower side or corner aligned with the end of the
28 parking space length or by outlining or painting the parking space in blue and outlining

1 on the ground in white or a suitable contrasting color a profile view of a wheel chair with
2 occupant. See CBC § 11B-502.6.4, et seq.

3 25. Here, Defendants failed to paint the International Symbol of Accessibility on
4 the surface as required. Additionally, Defendants failed to paint the identifying blue
5 perimeter line around the accessible parking space.

6 26. A public accommodation shall maintain in operable working condition those
7 features of facilities and equipment that are required to be readily accessible to and usable
8 by persons with disabilities by the Act or this part. 28 C.F.R. 35.211(a).

9 27. By failing to maintain the facility to be readily accessible and usable by
10 Plaintiff, Defendants are in violation of Plaintiff's rights under the ADA and its related
11 regulations.

12 28. The Business has denied and continues to deny full and equal access to
13 Plaintiff and to other people with disabilities. Plaintiff has been and will continue to be
14 discriminated against due to the lack of accessible facilities, and therefore, seeks
15 injunctive relief to alter facilities to make such facilities readily accessible to and usable
16 by individuals with disabilities.

17 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

18 **VIOLATION OF THE UNRUH CIVIL RIGHTS ACT**

19 29. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each of the allegations in all prior
20 paragraphs in this complaint.

21 30. California Civil Code § 51 states, "All persons within the jurisdiction of this
22 state are free and equal, and no matter what their sex, race, color, religion, ancestry,
23 national origin, disability, medical condition, genetic information, marital status, sexual
24 orientation, citizenship, primary language, or immigration status are entitled to the full
25 and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges, or services in all business
26 establishments of every kind whatsoever."

27 31. California Civil Code § 52 states, "Whoever denies, aids or incites a denial,
28 or make any discrimination or distinction contrary to Section 51, 515, or 51.6, is liable

1 for each and every offense for the actual damages, and any amount that may be
2 determined by a jury, or a court sitting without a jury, up to a maximum of three times the
3 amount of actual damage but in no case less than four thousand dollars (\$4,000) and any
4 attorney's fees that may be determined by the court in addition thereto, suffered by any
5 person denied the rights provided in Section 51, 51.5, or 51.6.

6 32. California Civil Code § 51(f) specifies, “a violation of the right of any
7 individual under federal Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-336)
8 shall also constitute a violation of this section.”

9 33. The actions and omissions of Defendants alleged herein constitute a denial
10 of full and equal accommodation, advantages, facilities, privileges, or services by
11 physically disabled persons within the meaning of California Civil Code §§ 51 and 52.
12 Defendants have discriminated against Plaintiff in violation of California Civil Code §§
13 51 and 52.

14 34. The violations of the Unruh Civil Rights Act caused Plaintiff to experience
15 difficulty, discomfort, or embarrassment. The Defendants are also liable for statutory
16 damages as specified in California Civil Code §55.56(a)-(c).

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA DISABLED PERSONS ACT

19 35. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each of the allegations in all prior
20 paragraphs in this complaint.

21 36. California Civil Code § 54.1(a) states, “Individuals with disabilities shall be
22 entitled to full and equal access, as other members of the general public, to
23 accommodations, advantages, facilities, medical facilities, including hospitals, clinics,
24 and physicians’ offices, and privileges of all common carriers, airplanes, motor vehicles,
25 railroad trains, motorbuses, streetcars, boats, or any other public conveyances or modes
26 of transportation (whether private, public, franchised, licensed, contracted, or otherwise
27 provided), telephone facilities, adoption agencies, private schools, hotels, loading places,
28 places of public accommodations, amusement, or resort, and other places in which the

1 general public is invited, subject only to the conditions and limitations established by
2 law, or state or federal regulation, and applicable alike to all persons.

3 37. California Civil Code § 54.3(a) states, “Any person or persons, firm or
4 corporation who denies or interferes with admittance to or enjoyment of public facilities
5 as specified in Sections 54 and 54.1 or otherwise interferes with the rights of an
6 individual with a disability under Sections 54, 54.1 and 54.2 is liable for each offense for
7 the actual damages, and any amount as may be determined by a jury, or a court sitting
8 without a jury, up to a maximum of three times the amount of actual damages but in no
9 case less than one thousand dollars (\$1,000) and any attorney’s fees that may be
10 determined by the court in addition thereto, suffered by any person denied the rights
11 provided in Section 54, 54.1, and 54.2.

12 38. California Civil Code § 54(d) specifies, “a violation of the right of an
13 individual under Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-336) also
14 constitute a violation of this section, and nothing in this section shall be construed to limit
15 the access of any person in violation of that act.

16 39. The actions and omissions of Defendants alleged herein constitute a denial
17 of full and equal accommodation, advantages, and facilities by physically disabled
18 persons within the meaning of California Civil Code § 54. Defendants have
19 discriminated against Plaintiff in violation of California Civil Code § 54.

20 40. The violations of the California Disabled Persons Act caused Plaintiff to
21 experience difficulty, discomfort, and embarrassment. The Defendants are also liable for
22 statutory damages as specified in California Civil Code §55.56(a)-(c).

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE § 19955, et seq.

25 41. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each of the allegations in all prior
26 paragraphs in this complaint.

27 42. Plaintiff and other similar physically disabled persons who require the use of
28 a wheelchair are unable to use public facilities on a "full and equal" basis unless each

1 such facility is in compliance with the provisions of California Health & Safety Code §
 2 19955 et seq. Plaintiff is a member of the public whose rights are protected by the
 3 provisions of California Health & Safety Code § 19955 et seq.

4 43. The purpose of California Health & Safety Code § 1995 et seq. is to ensure
 5 that public accommodations or facilities constructed in this state with private funds
 6 adhere to the provisions of Chapter 7 (commencing with Section 4450) of Division 5 of
 7 Title 1 of the Government Code. The code relating to such public accommodations also
 8 require that “when sanitary facilities are made available for the public, clients, or
 9 employees in these stations, centers, or buildings, they shall be made available for
 10 persons with disabilities.

11 44. Title II of the ADA holds as a “general rule” that no individual shall be
 12 discriminated against on the basis of disability in the full and equal enjoyment of goods
 13 (or use), services, facilities, privileges, and accommodations offered by any person who
 14 owns, operates, or leases a place of public accommodation. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a).
 15 Further, each and every violation of the ADA also constitutes a separate and distinct
 16 violation of California Civil Code §§ 54(c) and 54.1(d), thus independently justifying an
 17 award of damages and injunctive relief pursuant to California law, including but not
 18 limited to Civil Code § 54.3 and Business and Professions Code § 17200, et seq.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

NEGLIGENCE

21 45. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each of the allegations in all prior
 22 paragraphs in this complaint.

23 46. Defendants have a general duty and a duty under the ADA, Unruh Civil
 24 Rights Act and California Disabled Persons Act to provide safe and accessible facilities
 25 to the Plaintiff.

26 47. Defendants breached their duty of care by violating the provisions of ADA,
 27 Unruh Civil Rights Act and California Disabled Persons Act.

48. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' negligent conduct, Plaintiff has suffered damages.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully prays for relief and judgment against Defendants as follows:

1. For preliminary and permanent injunction directing Defendants to comply with the Americans with Disability Act and the Unruh Civil Rights Act;

2. Award of all appropriate damages, including but not limited to statutory damages, general damages and treble damages in amounts, according to proof;

3. Award of all reasonable restitution for Defendants' unfair competition practices;

4. Reasonable attorney's fees, litigation expenses, and costs of suit in this action;

5. Prejudgment interest pursuant to California Civil Code § 3291; and

6. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY

Pursuant to Rule 38(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

Dated: March 12, 2024

SO. CAL. EQUAL ACCESS GROUP

By: /s/ Jason J. Kim
Jason J. Kim, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff